

Serial No.: 10/560,148

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

Please substitute the drawing sheet with Figs 1-2 with the attached sheet of Replacement Drawings including FIGS. 1-2.

REMARKS

The undersigned attorney thanks the Examiner for her comments. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this Patent Application, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks. No additional fee is due for this Amendment because the number of independent claims is not more than three and the total number of claims is not more than twenty.

Telephone Interview Request

Applicant requests the Examiner contact the undersigned at (847) 490-1400 to schedule a telephone interview to discuss the merits of this Patent Application.

Drawings

Applicant has submitted replacement figures for FIGS. 1-2. The undersigned could determine the elements described in the Specification on the replacement sheet, so the replacement sheet overcomes the objection to FIG. 1.

Claims

Applicant has amended Claims 1-5 and 11-13 in response to the comments in the Office Action. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the shielding element shields at least one of the armature and the electromagnet

from magnetic radiation acting external of the lock housing. Support for amended Claim 1 can be found at, for example, page 8, last paragraph, of the Substitute Specification. Claim 9 has been canceled, without prejudice, and new Claims 17-21 have been added, which find support in the original claims and at, for example, page 8, last paragraph, of the Substitute Specification. No new matter has been added by this Amendment.

Specification

Applicant has amended the typographical error in the Specification, thereby rendering the objection to the Specification moot.

Claim Objections/Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The objection to Claims 3 and 11 is rendered moot by the above Amendment.

The above Amendment also renders moot the rejection of Claims 1-9 and 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Regarding the rejection of Claim 1, the phrase “arranged one of on and in the housing” is not unclear, and is equivalent to “arranged on or in the housing.” To expedite prosecution, the latter alternative phrasing has been adopted for Claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of Claims 1-5 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Engler, U.S. Patent 6,647,753, in view of Goldman, U.S. Patent No. 5,339,662, is respectfully traversed.

The Engler Patent is cited for teaching a lock, but not having Applicant's recited shielding element made of a low-retentive magnetic material. The Goldman Patent is applied on the allegation that it "shows that it is well known in the art to provide a shield for the electromagnet in addition to the housing" (Office Action, page 5). The alleged "shield 98" in the Goldman Patent is not the same as Applicant's recited shielding element. The U-shaped channel 98 of the Goldman Patent is for strengthening the casing 54, and there is no mention of the U-shaped channel 98 shielding the magnet from outside magnetic interference as in Applicant's invention. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the differences between the invention and the Goldman Patent, and Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

The rejection of Claims 6-8 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Engler, U.S. Patent 6,647,753, in view of Goldman, U.S. Patent No. 5,339,662, and further in view of Roth, U.S. Patent 6,609,738, is respectfully traversed. Claims 6-8 and 14-16 depend from amended Claim 1, and are patentable

for at least the same reasons discussed above. The Roth patent does not provide the deficiency discussed above for Claim 1.

The rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Goldman, U.S. Patent No. 5,339,662, is rendered moot by its canceling. New Claim 17 is added in place of canceled Claim 9, and includes limitations of original Claims 1 and 9.

Conclusion

Applicant intends to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. If the Examiner detects any issue which the Examiner believes Applicant has not addressed in this response, Applicant's undersigned attorney again requests a telephone interview with the Examiner.

Applicant sincerely believes that this Patent Application is now in condition for allowance and, thus, respectfully requests early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark D. Swanson
Registration No. 48,498

Pauley Petersen & Erickson
2800 West Higgins Road, Suite 365
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60169
(847) 490-1400
FAX (847) 490-1403